

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/699,799	HIRAGUCHI, KAZUO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott Haugland	3654	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark Wallerson

(3) _____

(2) Scott Haugland

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 8/22/06

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: of record

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed adding limitations requiring door to slide between open & closed positions while remaining in case. Ex'r believes LeNoue et al teaches solution to problem of deformation at peripheral walls.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Scott G. Haugland
Examiner's signature, if required